



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

Г	APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,419		04	/15/2005	Christian Putzi	4303-1004	7921
	466 7590 07/25/2006				EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON					UNDERWOOD, DONALD W	
		745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202				PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/531,419	PUTZI, CHRISTIAN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
0	Donald Underwood	3652				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	<u> </u>					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 072605.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/531,419

Art Unit: 3652

DETAILED ACTION

The preliminary amendment filed 04/15/05 referenced an Abstract. The referenced Abstract was not received. Applicant should submit another copy of this Abstract if he wants an Abstract other than the original.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Larsen.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/531,419

Art Unit: 3652

Claims 1, 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt, et al. in view of Wu, et al.

It would have been obvious to substitute an arm as claimed for each arm in Schmidt in view of the teaching in Wu. Note Wu's arm is like the claimed arm. This would have been an obvious substitution of equivalent arms.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson, et al. in view of Wooten, et al.

It would have been obvious to provide the station in Larsen with an inspection area before manufacturing in view of the teaching in Wooten to provide a way to prevent processing f defective wafers. Note Wooten figure 1. this inspection area would be positioned stations 40 in Larsen.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt, et al. in view of Wu, et al. as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Gonzalez.

It would have been obvious to use end effectors in Schmidt as modified by Wu that flip the wafer to provide ability to process wafers more efficiently in view of the teaching in Gonzales.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald Underwood whose telephone number is 571-272-6933. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thursday 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen D. Lillis can be reached on 571-272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Donald Underwood
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3652

072406